Leveraging knowledge mobilization efforts in the media: Creating partnerships between researchers and journalists

Authors: Amanda Cooper, Stephen MacGregor, Gordon Katic

CSSE 2017

Introduction

Modern society is characterized by fast paced media and social media. Never before has information (and misinformation) had the capacity to have global spread virtually instantaneously. However, the basis of news media has become increasingly important; especially in the political climate where credible stories are branded as fake news by those who would disagree with the facts. Research remains a publicly funded enterprise, as such it is important that researchers and universities find ways to communicate the findings from research back to society in ways that are accessible and engaging. Universities and research funders are also increasingly interested in how to increase the impact of research in society. It seems obvious that the media is an important mechanism to disseminate research and bring evidence to bare on important societal issues; however, empirical evidence on the frequency of interactions between researchers and media tells the story of two worlds that remain uncoupled for the most part – with researchers reluctant or unable to express research in ways that might be accessible and engaging for the public, and with journalists lamenting that most researchers are terrible at translating and communicating the implications of their work for broader society. This article arises from a project called CITED (www.citedpodcast.com) that facilitates researchers, community members, and journalists working together to weave statistics and qualitative data into engaging narratives that can inform the debate on important societal issues. This paper provides a brief overview of the project, a literature exploring salient issues that arise throughout research-media interactions, and provides an overview of what CITED has accomplished to date. It also provides plans for empirical work currently underway to expand our understanding of how researchers and journalists can forge stronger partnerships – efforts we refer to as knowledge mobilization (KMb).

Literature Review

This literature review is constructed in a way that codifies the contemporary literature dealing with research-media interactions and builds towards the relevance of CITED. The review describes the importance of research-media interactions from the perspectives of multiple stakeholders, outlines how current interactions are influenced by a turbulent history, explains the complexities associated with effective interactions, and identifies current barriers and facilitators to effective interactions. This review concludes with an overview of how the CITED projects contribute to the dearth of empirical work on knowledge mobilization processes associated with researchers and media professionals.

Recognizing the importance of research-media interactions

At the heart of a well-informed democracy is the effective transfer of knowledge from the ivory tower of research institutions into public discourse, seeding the growth of policy and practice (Nutley, Walter, & Davies, 2007; Peters et al., 2008). Unambiguously, researchers and media professionals are the primary players in the commodification of knowledge for public consumption (Brass & Rowe, 2009; Chapman et al., 2014), and the value of interacting is

palpable for both actors. For researchers, media interaction presents opportunities to legitimize research (Peters et al., 2008), extend influence beyond the walls of academia (Chapman et al., 2014), peer into the black box of policymaking (Waddell et al., 2005), and demonstrate to taxpayers a return on their investment (Wien, 2014). In fact, for many researchers "refusing media contacts without legitimate reason has become unacceptable" (Peters, 2013, p. 14105). The view of researchers as specialists who function primarily within their own academic sphere is becoming antiquated. For media professionals, researcher interaction is first and foremost a method for legitimizing media coverage (Albaek, 2011): soliciting expert opinion lends credibility and the perception of objectivity to media coverage. Additionally, by interacting with researchers, media professionals can divest the need to fit research in fleeting news timelines (Nielsen & Autzen, 2011) and more accurately communicate the implications of research to local audiences (Amend & Secko, 2012).

Researchers and media professionals are not the sole actors to glean value from interacting, as community members similarly reap the benefits of fruitful interactions. Specifically, efficacious research-media interactions allow community members to become holders of *specialist knowledge* (Peters, 2013), which can inform and influence salient issues in the public sphere (Chapman et al., 2014). Moreover, positive research-media interactions have the potential to enhance community members' trust in science and the perceived importance of science in grounding political decision making (Chapman et al., 2014; Yettick, 2015). However, despite the well-recognized importance of research-media interactions, present-day interactions are burdened by a turbulent past and perceptions that have been accordingly slow to change.

Moving beyond a turbulent history

While few researchers or media professionals would struggle to perceive the value of interacting, impetus to form relationships is strained by a troubled history (Dunwoody, Brossard, & Dudo, 2009; Peters et al., 2008). Even as of recent the relationship between researchers and media professionals has been publicly tried, with events like the Galathea 3 expedition—a largely unsuccessful attempt to stimulate research-media interaction by proximity on a nautical research vessel—inciting hesitation among many individuals (Nielsen & Autzen, 2011). Historically, researchers and media professionals "routinely misperceive each other's motives, embrace different and sometimes conflicting norms, and encounter significant difficulties when interacting with each other" (Dunwoody et al., 2009, p. 300).

Owing to this history, researchers and media professionals have been slow to change their negative perceptions about interaction (Peters et al., 2008). For researchers, concerns predominately involve the accuracy of coverage (Chapman et al., 2014; Peters et al., 2008; Waddell et al., 2005; Wien, 2014); the uninformed, egalitarian perspective afforded to some topics (Orr, 2010); and the uncritical, sensationalist framing of research that often occurs before media professionals solicit expert opinion (Albaek, 2011; Amend & Secko, 2012; Chapman et al., 2014). Additionally, many researchers are dissuaded from interaction with the media due to the negative vocal minority (Peters et al., 2008): researchers who have experienced problematic encounters that stridently voice their experiences to the masses. Given the already demanding structure of academia, it is unsurprising that researchers holding these perspectives would be hesitant to invest their time with the media. For media professionals, a similar range of perceptions hamper potential interaction, including the inaccessibility of many researchers

(Waddell et al., 2005), researchers generally lacking the ability to effectively communicate their research (Chapman et al., 2014), and the ambiguous agenda for interaction often held by researchers and their respective institutions (Amend & Secko, 2012). Similar to academia, the dizzying pace of the media industry leaves little time for media professionals to dissect these concerns. To move beyond the turbulent history of research-media interactions and associated negative perceptions, an understanding of the complexity of these interactions is required.

Grappling with the complexity of research-media interactions

As alluded to in describing the Galathea 3 expedition, inciting effective interactions between researchers and media professionals is more complex than simply adjusting for proximity. While this complexity largely stems from the evolving roles of researchers and media professionals (Wien, 2014), empirical work has indicated that several factors consistently influence interactions. When media look to engage with researchers the two most commonly reported factors associated with initiating an interaction are a researcher's sector and status. Researchers working in the social sciences and researchers with numerous high-ranking publications are the most likely to be contacted (Albaek, 2011; Yettick, 2015). In fact, the sector aspect of interactions has been identified so consistently that the separation between researchers and the media has been described as "a steep canyon in the sciences but a smooth valley in the humanities and social sciences" (Peters, 2013, p. 14103). There are also several noteworthy factors associated with the media that complicate interactions, of which a prominent consideration is media professionals' academic history. An examination of the quality of education research featured by the media revealed that many media professionals lack formal academic science training, which impedes their ability to utilize peer-reviewed publications (Yettick, 2015). This training-based issue further leads to the noted issue of power dynamics, whereby media professionals tend to engage with researchers under the pretense that there is a need to equalize a perceived status imbalance that favors researchers (Amend & Secko, 2012).

In spite of the complexity of effective interactions, researchers and media professionals alike report their interaction experience to be more positive and efficient than commonly discussed (Amend & Secko, 2012; Chapman et al., 2014, Wien, 2014). Indeed, researchers rarely report dissatisfaction with media coverage of their work and media professionals tend to find interactions fruitful (Dunwoody et al., 2009; Nielsen & Autzen, 2011). Contestation for the positive evaluation of most research-media interactions primarily emanates from researchers' discrepant analysis of coverage. A suggested reason for this dissonance of opinion is researchers' application of different criteria when assessing the quality of coverage (Peters et al. 2008), where minor inaccuracies in personal research are viewed as more acceptable than inaccuracies in their peers' research. However, in addition to appreciating the discrepant analysis of some actors, changing the dominant perceptions about the adversity of interaction requires identifying common barriers and facilitators.

Barriers and facilitators of the research-media interface

The success or failure of particular research-media interactions is not exclusively attributable to the participating researchers and media professionals: factors external to either actor exert substantial influence. In the arena of barriers, the foremost influencers of interactions are the competing value systems and organizational structures of academia and the media (Amend & Secko, 2012; Orr, 2010). On the path to achieving an effective interaction,

researchers and media professionals must navigate differences associated with "time, use of language, the notion of balance, and prospective audiences (Amend & Secko, 2012). The professional environments occupied by researchers and the media are inherently incongruous (Orr, 2010). In addition to the shared barriers, researchers must yield to institutional incentives that value publishing over outreach (Waddell et al., 2005) and a culture that views the seeking of media coverage as outside the realm of proper research (Chapman et al., 2014). Conversely, media professionals must attempt to manage a persistent pressure to publish, the need for stories that fulfill the quality of newsworthiness, and the necessary bending to editorial interests (Canan & Hartman, 2007; Nielsen & Autzen, 2011; Waddell et al., 2005). Managing both the shared barriers and the barriers unique to each actor is necessary to ensure interactions proceed smoothly.

Unfortunately, facilitators of effective research-media interactions have occupied minimal space in the literature compared to identified barriers. The space that has been afforded is mostly filled by calls for interaction training that highlight the need for researchers to learn about media communication and for media professionals to enhance their critical appraisal of research and completeness of research coverage (Chapman et al., 2014; Dunwoody et al., 2009; Waddell et al., 2005). Ostensibly, the apex of interaction training would be the creation of forums where researchers and media professionals can negotiate the proper covering of research (Wien, 2014). It is in this area that CITED adds to the literature of research-media interactions.

What is CITED?

Cited aims to bring important academic work to life by combining in-depth research with original storytelling in KMb podcasts. We define a KMb podcast as a downloadable audio file that focuses on integrating empirical research with diverse stakeholder perspectives to inform important societal issues. Podcasts are emerging as a KMb mechanism in health that are used for a variety of purposes including training, professional development, teaching in higher education, and more:

> Podcasting's essence is about creating content (audio or video- vodcasts) for an audience that wants to listen when they want, where they want, and how they want. Users can listen to podcasts and watch vodcasts on their computer (e.g. using Windows Media Player), or download to portable MP3?MP4 players and listen/watch on the move/anywhere (Boulos & Wheeler, 2007, p.3).

In 26 episodes, CITED interviewed 68 researchers, 42 of which came from the social sciences and humanities. Unlike most CBC or NPR programs, academic guests for CITED were not mere commentators, but were central in the goal of using evidence to inform societal debates. Each segment was built to highlight a key research finding or a particular researcher. Examples include:

- Peter Seixas, Professor of Education at UBC — Episode #3 of *Cited*.

In *"Who Killed Canadian History?"* we looked at competing visions for how to teach Canadian history to secondary school students. Is history education about articulating a country's grand historical narrative or critically engaging with the complicated and

conflicting stories that make up that country? The third segment featured the work of Peter Seixas. His book, "The Big Six," co-authored by Robert Morton, has transformed history education across Canada. We went into a Vancouver secondary school and captured how these ideas work in the classroom. This episode was used as classroom material in a two 100-level history courses, one at UBC and one at SFU. Further, it was shared as a professional development resource to every teaching assistant in the UBC history department

- Neil Guppy, Professor of Sociology at UBC — Episode #52 of *the Terry Project*

In *"The New Debt Politics,"* we looked at how shifting federal priorities since the early 1990s have radically reshaped Canadian universities. Neil Guppy wrote a research article about how a federal university grant (the Canadian Foundation for Innovation) has privileged brick-and-mortar development of marketable engineering and scientific disciplines—at the expense of the social sciences and humanities. To illustrate this, we did a tour of UBC with Professor Guppy, and further told the history of UBC's own development.

- Katherine Beckett, Professor of Sociology at the University of Washington — Episode #1 of *Cited*

In *"Superpredators Revisited,"* we told the story of one Seattle-area man, Jeff Coats, who was sent to an adult prison at the age of 14. His story elucidated two key research trends within criminology: first, a shifting stance on the potential to rehabilitate prisoners; and second, a 1990s paranoia about the coming of teenage 'superpredators.' Through Jeff Coat's story, interviews with Professor Beckett, and extensive blog posts, we revealed influential research trends and asked broader questions about the limitations of social science research, and the political and personal effects of poor social science research.

Table 1 provides further summaries of episodes, linked to the podcasts, including contributors.

Table 1
Cited podcast descriptions

Title/Hyperlink	Description	Contributors
#41: The Heroin Clinic	At Crosstown Clinic, doctors are turning addiction treatment on its head: they're prescribing heroin-users the very drug they're addicted to. This is the story of one clinic's quest to remove the harms of addiction, without removing the addiction itself.	Dr. Scott Macdonald Kevin Thompson, patient Diane Tobin, former patient
#38: The Conservative War Against Liberal Sex Education	Another chapter in the continuing battle between wonks and Christian conservatives, this time in Canada. In 2010, a small but influential group of Catholics forced Ontario Premier Dalton McGuinty into scrapping his government's proposal for updating the sexual education curriculum. In 2015, Premier Kathleen Wynne decided to try again.	It was written, edited, produced and hosted by Sam Fenn, Gordon Katic, and Alexander Kim

To listen to podcasts, visit http://citedpodcast.com For research, visit http://www.ripplenetwork.ca

#31: A Proud Benchwarmer–Kaye Kaminshi & the Vancouver Asahi	Kaye Kaminishi is the last surviving member of the Vancouver Asahi, a Japanese Canadian baseball club. The team was disbanded 75 years ago today, when Japan attacked Pearl Harbor.	*A Proud Benchwarmer* was produced by Sam Fenn, Gordon Katic, Alexander Kim, and Eli Yarhi for *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, a division of Historical Canada.
#30: Exiled Part 2–The Mennonites and the Sex Offenders	Across Canada, Mennonite-volunteers are helping high-risk sex-offenders reintegrate after they're released from prison. Sam Fenn goes to Regina to meet a sex offender and the group of untrained volunteers who spend their free time with him.	This is part two of a two-part documentary series we produced in partnership with the CBC Doc Project and the University of Washington Center For Human Rights.
#29: Exiled Part 1–A Year In New York's Infamous 'Sex Offender Motel'	Sex offenders are the most reviled and abused criminals in prison. But eventually, most of them will get out. So, what happens next?	This is part one of a two-part documentary series we produced in partnership with the CBC Doc Project and the University of Washington Center For Human Rights.
Episode #7: The Other Climate Change Consensus	You've heard that scientists have a pretty strong consensus on the science of climate change. But did you know that social scientists have a pretty strong consensus on what to do about it? This week, we offer simple solutions to humanity's most overwhelming problem.	Guests (in order): Gary Clarke (UBC), Gary Pickering (Brock), Catherine Potvin (McGill), Julie Van de Valk (UBCC350), Mark Jacobson (Stanford), Chris Bataille (Navius Research and SFU), Kathryn Harrison (UBC).
Episode #6: The Secret Science of Video Games	Video game developers are using crude experimental psychology and behavioural economics to make simple games that get you hooked. One professor used satire to fight back, but not everyone got the joke.	Ian Bogost, Jason Tanz, Adam Scriven, Nicholas Lovell, Ramin Shokrizade, Jamie Madigan, James Ivory, and Richard Smith.
Episode #5: Harm Reduction Under Attack	Researchers, doctors, and public health advocates are up in arms about Bill C-2, aka *the Respect for Communities Act,* which they say is a direct attack on evidence-based harm reduction supplies and services.	No info provided
Episode #4: Dissecting Bill C-51	Legal scholars across the country are protesting Prime Minister Harper's new anti-terror bill, Bill C-51. We explain why. Further, we speak with Liberal Party Leader Justin Trudeau, and we take you to protests all across Canada.	Justin Trudeau, Liberal Party Leader
Episode #3: Who Killed Canadian History?	From the Hertiage Minutes/Drake mashup, to Harper's grand historical narrative; we debate Canadian history and how it ought to be taught.	Gordon Katic Sam Fenn

| Episode #1: 'Superpredators' Revisited | Jeff Coats was 14 years old when he kidnapped David Grenier. 20 years later, Jeff and David reflect on the crime and how it transformed their lives. | Jeff Coats (ex-kidnapper?) David Grenier (kidnappee?) The Law, Societies & Justice Program and the Center for Human Rights at the the University of Washington. |

CITED covers a broad range of topics as does research that is occurring across disciplines.

What has the Uptake of CITED been?

CITED has had growing uptake over the course of producing KMb podcasts. Table 2 shows a summary of key figures from the 2015 season.

Table 2
Key figures from 2015

A Snapshot of Key Figures in the 2015 Season	N
Episodes	26
Online listens and downloads (excludes radio)	14452
Subscribers (iTunes + Soundcloud)	537
Radio stations we broadcasted from	94
Live BARtalk events	5
BARtalk attendance (estimated)	350
Social science and humanities researchers featured	42
Researchers from other disciplines	26
iTunes store rating (26 reviews)	5/5

Listenership

Our goal was 50,000 online listeners by the end of the 2015 season. We learned that this goal was out of reach (Table 3).

Table 3
Overview of listenership of Cited

Listenership	N
Total	14452
Itunes	6710
Soundcloud	4746
Bonus content	2296
Old content	700

In September and October of 2015, *The Terry Project on CiTR* (the old name for the CITED program before rebranding) saw increased listenership on our *Four Pillars* series, which was distributed by *the Tyee*. The program sustained listenership through November. However, the audience dropped dramatically through December to February. This follows our trend from the past two seasons, and closely follows the trend of readership for UBC's student publication, *the Ubyssey*. This reveals important limitations of the campus audience, and our ability to reach outside of it with such limited marketing resources.

We further learned that our branding as *The Terry Project* did not secure us a meaningful audience this year. Although *The Terry Project* has a significant social media presence, the engagement and traffic numbers have fell over the last several years. The *Cited* rebrand was a necessary step towards clarifying the goals, values, and purpose of our show. Upon rebranding, we saw steady iTunes subscriber growth, followed by increased media attention (featured in *the Georgia Straight, Seattle Weekly*, Vancouver Co-op Radio, and NRP-affiliate KUOW). In March, we saw a significant spike in listenership.

Despite lower than expected online listenership, we had unexpected growth in radio listenership. In total, our work was featured on at least 94 campus and community radio stations. Each episode of *Cited* was syndicated on three stations. Our 5-part *Four Pillars* series was syndicated on 4 radio stations, and ran concurrent articles in *the Tyee*. Further, in partnership with *Radio Ecoshock*, our 53rd episode aired on 88 campus and community stations stations across North America. Finally, our first (and most ambitious) episode of *Cited* aired on NPR affiliate KUOW, which broadcasts from Seattle, and has a listenership of over 440,000 per week. Further, KUOW's morning news program played segments and interviews promoting our documentary.

Can a university create a popular radio documentary program at low cost, without a major media partner? Our experience offers a number of important lessons (Table 4 and 5). When we clarified our branding and messaging, we saw significant growth in listenership and subscribers—without the support of existing media. Media attention followed, partly a result of increased emphasis on outreach, and partly a result of our clearer branding. As *The Terry Project on CiTR*, we did see periods of increased listenership through partnerships (*Boing Boing* in 2013/14, *the Tyee* in 2014/15). However, subscribers did not grow significantly. This suggests that one-off partnerships will boost individual episodes, but not necessarily build a loyal audience.

Table 4
Strengths and Weaknesses of Cited Listenership

Listenership: Strengths	Listenership: Weaknesses
Aired on 94 Campus and community radio stations across North America	Lagging online listenership, especially December to February
Work featured on larger media outlets, including the *Tyee, the Georgia Straight, Seattle Weekly,* and NPR affiliate KUOW	Poor traffic and social media engagement from *The Terry Project's* channels

| Increased subscriber growth after *Cited* rebranding, and strong social media engagement | Delayed rebrand too long |

Table 5
Key lessons on Listenership, and plans for further funding

Listenership: Key Lessons	Listenership: With Further Funding
We can grow CITED through effective branding, adept use of social media, and partnership with campus groups- but not without extra support	Hire an additional student staff member to maintain CITED's online presence, and to build on- and off-campus partnerships.
CITED could be syndicated on almost any campus station in Canada	Build organic listener growth by arranging regular syndication deals.
Media partnerships are helpful to boost numbers, but there is no guarantee that the attention will build a loyal audience	Pitch specific proejcts to large media partners, and build long-term agreements with smaller distributors who might desire regular content.

Stakeholder Involvement

Involving diverse stakeholders in KMb efforts has been widely cited in the literature as a mechanism to increase uptake and impact (Morton, 2014; Nutley et al., 2007; Phipps, 2013). Episodes to date have included 68 researchers and 81 non-researchers. Of the 68 researchers, 42 (62%) have been from the Social Sciences and Humanities, with 26 (38%) being from Table 6 shows the kinds of researchers that have been involved from each discipline.

Table 6
Researchers from different disciplines that have participated in Cited podcasts

Discipline	N
Social Science and Humanities	**42**
Political science	8
Communications and english	5
Sociology	4
Education	4
Law	4
Criminology	4
Social psychology	4
Geography	3
History	3
Public policy	2
Philosophy	1

Outside Social Sciences and Humanities	26
Health*	11
Natural and Life Sciences	6
Psychology**	6
Other	3

*Health – counted as psychiatry, medicine, and public health disciplines- primarily featured in *Four Pillars* series.
**Social psychology counted as a social science, all other psychology counted as outside social science.

Researchers have been primarily from Canadian Universities (78%), but there has been some representation (22%) from international universities. There have also been a number of non-researchers involved. Table 7 shows a breakdown of the kinds of other stakeholders that have been integrated into the process**.**

Table 7
Non-academic stakeholders that have participated in Cited

Type of Stakeholder	N
Ordinary people	19
Politicians & bureaucrats	8
Activists	6
Social workers & counsellors	8
Journalists	9
Lawyers	3
Artists	4
Business people	3
Elementary teacher	1
Student (elementary)	3
Student (undergraduate)	11
Student (graduate)	6

There have been strengths and weaknesses associated with stakeholder involvement in *Cited* (Table 8).

Table 8
Strengths and weaknesses of stakeholder involvement in Cited

Stakeholder Involvement: Strengths	Stakeholder Involvement: Weaknesses
Diverse representation from inside and outside the social science and humanities	Many pieces include a number of voices discussing some research trend or idea. This is effective, but not particularly valuable to any one researcher

Diverse representation of voices outside of the academy, including: ordinary citizens, activists, journalist, politicians, and students	At times, episodes too often drifted towards highlighting researchers critical of existing public policy. Best episodes revealed ground-breaking research, then discussed public policy.
CITED used as instructional material in at least two courses, and shared amongst history department teaching assistants as professional development	No resources to build outreach strategy to locate faculty members and courses that would be interested in collaborating

The Cited team has also identified key lessons and directions for further funding associated with stakeholder involvement (Table 9).

Table 9
Stakeholder involvement in Cited: Key lessons and future funding

Stakeholder Involvement: Key Lessons	Stakeholder Involvement: With Further Funding
Because of our program's focus on complex issues of public import (e.g. climate change), ensuring interdisciplinarity was not difficult. Adequately addressing these issues demands a diversity of perspectives.	Devote more time to working with specific researchers to highlight their individual projects, like in 'Who Killed Canadian History?' This requires additional planning and research in the summer, before entering the hectic production schedule.
A balance of expert/non-expert voices helps to connect research with people's lives—including their personal struggles, and the broader public policy decisions that shape them.	Do more reporting to locate exemplary characters like Jeff in Superpredators Revisited, or Zeena in Zombie City, and continually develop our capacity to weave expert and non-expert stories.
Since our very first episode, professors have praised us for our depth. However, Cited has never felt didactic. This reveals that high caliber radio can be both entertaining and educational.	Build an outreach strategy to locate professors to collaborate with on episodes for their existing classes.

How CITED adds to the field
The need for effective interactions between researchers and media professionals is unmistakable, with Canadian society increasingly expecting media coverage of research to be accurate and complete. Furthermore, the frontline knowledge of community members is becoming recognized as an essential component to include in this previously bipartite interaction. The CITED projects are the first, to our knowledge, to address these tripartite collaborations between researchers, media professionals, and community members with the aim to enhance public discourse and bring research to bear on important societal issues.

Future Research

If there is one thing CITED has demonstrated, it is that there is a need for our program. Universities like UBC cannot not wait for the media to call. In the Canadian media landscape, there is very little longform documentary content. Even less about academic work or academic ideas. This situation will not improve. There are very few 'beat' reporters who cover social science and humanities research. Increasingly, inexperienced journalists are merely reporting on study results, and relying on press releases from university press offices. As revealed in the work of University of Alberta Law professor Timothy Caulfield, this relationship is the first step in a 'hype pipeline' that distorts academic findings.

If the academy wants impactful and accurate stories told, it should pay for them. The American Psychological Association, which publishes the magazine Psychology Today, has shown that this is possible. However, no one university has ever produced something like *Cited*—because *Cited* is not cheap. *Cited* requires dedicated producers, researchers, and marketing support. Through volunteering above and beyond paid hours, the program has been able to produce a quality and quantity of content that exceeds what the funding it has had.

However, some broader perspective is warranted here. The cost of producing the research that *Cited* features on any given episode far exceeds the total cost of producing the 26 episodes in 2015. For example, Peter Seixas' Historical Thinking Project cost millions, but never received a minute of media attention. Although the work has profound public policy implications, and has impacted teachers all across Canada, the public has little knowledge of it. As the federal government embraced historical commemoration and cut vital programs that support historical research across Canada, Canadians would have benefited from understanding Professor Seixas' research.

The easiest part of the *Cited* producers has been finding these kinds of stories. There is a wealth of untapped material — from brilliant research, to interesting events, to inspiring activism — that happens every day. However, faculty members do not know how to translate this material into an accessible story. The 'Superpredators' episode is another instructive example. Professor Katherine Beckett had been sitting on several hours of interview video for over a year, thinking about what to do with it. She assembled a team of student volunteers to create short YouTube videos. However, this was the wrong medium for her project. Further, her team never had the technical expertise to finish. If not for our experience working closely with researchers of criminal justice and drug policy, we would never had met Professor Beckett, and this project would never have happened.

Going forward, it is clear that *Cited* program demands a broader partnership. UBC and one small SSHRC grant should not shoulder the burden of producing the academy's only longform storytelling program. *Cited* should become a partnership between universities, scholarly associations, grant-making agencies, and media organizations.

Over the next year, building this partnership can become the priority. While SSHRC funding is complete, TLEF funding remains. This will cover us at approximately half capacity. Three key accomplishments over the past year position us well to seek continued funding:

1. *Cited* will serve as a success story to inspire future partnerships. Over the past three years, *Cited* produced 66 radio documentaries. Much of that work was done with little or no budget, but still received substantial listenership and critical acclaim—including a national documentary award.

2. The *Cited* team has figured out who they are, what they value, and how to articulate that. Cited's tagline is 'how the ideas of the ivory tower shape our world.' That frame has focused the *Cited* program. *Cited* is not simply about highlighting interesting research—though, it has done that. *Cited* is about interrogated bigger questions about the relationship between research, policy, and public opinion. This frame could be attractive to several organizations with a stake in public policy and research mobilization, including: universities, think-tanks, grant-making organizations, and new-media foundations.

3. Our team has important relationships with various organizations inside and out of UBC, including: the UBC School of Journalism, the Michael Smith Laboratories, the Faculty of Arts, the Centre for Student Involvement and Careers, the Alma Mater Society, CiTR, CJSF, the University of Washington, the Tyee, the Seattle Weekly, KUOW, Roundhouse Radio, and the Extraenvironmentalist. These relationships could be leveraged into future partnerships.

We received a SSHRC partnership development grant in 2016, and currently the research team is interviewing researchers, journalists, and other stakeholders that have been involved with the production of the CITED KMb podcasts to illuminate the broader implications of podcasts as a mechanism for KMb, and how stronger partnerships between researchers and journalists might be forged.

References

Albaek, E. (2011). The interaction between experts and journalists in news journalism. *Journalism*, *12*(3), 335–348. http://doi.org/10.1177/1464884910392851

Amend, E., & Secko, D. M. (2012). In the face of critique: A metasynthesis of the experiences of journalists covering health and science. *Science Communication*, *34*(2), 241–282. http://doi.org/10.1177/1075547011409952

Brass, K., & Rowe, D. (2009). Knowledge limited: Public communication, risk and university media policy. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, *23*(1), 53–76. http://doi.org/10.1080/10304310802570874

Canan, P., & Hartman, M. (2007). Science-journalism collaboration: An experiment in closing the communication gap. *Applied Environmental Education & Communication*, *6*(2), 167–177. http://doi.org/10.1080/15330150701598247

Chapman, S., Haynes, A., Derrick, G., Sturk, H., Hall, W. D., & St George, A. (2014). Reaching "an audience that you would never dream of speaking to": Influential public health researchers' views on the role of news media in influencing policy and public understanding. *Journal of Health Communication*, *19*(2), 260–273. http://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2013.811327

Dunwoody, S., Brossard, D., & Dudo, A. (2009). Socialization or rewards? Predicting U.S. scientist-media interactions. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, *86*(2), 299–314. http://doi.org/10.1177/107769900908600203

Kamel Boulos, M. N., & Wheeler, S. (2007). The emerging Web 2.0 social software: An enabling suite of sociable technologies in health and health care education. *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, *24*(1), 2–23. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2007.00701.x

Morton, S. (2014). Creating research impact: The roles of research users in interactive research mobilisation. *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, *11*(1), 35–56. http://doi.org/10.1332/174426514X13976529631798

Nielsen, K. H., & Autzen, C. (2011). Looking over the shoulders of researchers: In quest of a research-media partnership and online, news media-based researcher identities on the Galathea 3 Expedition from 2006 to 2007. *Science Communication*, *33*(4), 472–500. http://doi.org/10.1177/1075547011408924

Nutley, S. M., Walter, I., & Davies, H. T. O. (2007). *Using evidence: How research can inform public services*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press. Retrieved from http://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/distributed/U/bo13441009.html

Orr, G. (2010). Academics and the media in Australia. *Australian Universities' Review*, *52*(1), 23–31. Retrieved from https://ssrn.com/abstract=1572245

Peters, H. P. (2013). Gap between science and media revisited: Scientists as public communicators. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *110*, 14102–14109. http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1212745110

Peters, H. P., Brossard, D., de Cheveigné, S., Dunwoody, S., Kallfass, M., Miller, S., & Tsuchida, S. (2008). Science-media interface: It's time to consider. *Science Communication*, *30*(2), 266–276. http://doi.org/10.1177/1075547008324809

Phipps, D. (2013). Mobilizing knowledge, bridging communities, accelerating impact. Blog, Toronto: Social Innovation Generation. Retrieved from http://www.sigeneration.ca/mobilizing-knowledge-bridging-communities-accelerating-impact/

Waddell, C., Lomas, J., Lavis, J. N., Abelson, J., Shepherd, C. A., & Bird-Gayson, T. (2005). Joining the conversation: Newspapers journalists' views on working with researchers. *Healthcare Policy*, *1*(1), 123–139. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/issues/173687/

Wien, C. (2014). Commentators on daily news or communicators of scholarly achievements? The role of researchers in Danish news media. *Journalism*, *15*(4), 427–445. http://doi.org/10.1177/1464884913490272

Yettick, H. (2015). One small droplet: News media coverage of peer-reviewed and university-based education research and academic expertise. *Educational Researcher*, *44*(3), 173–184. http://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X15574903